THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

31 July 1986

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 12 June 1986 minutes.

B. Dates of next meetings:

18 September 1986, 10:00 AM (Thursday)

16 October 1986, 10:00 AM (Thursday)

C. Statement by Neil H. Porterfield, Vice Chairman, on S. 2522, a bill to provide standards for placement of commemorative works on certain federal lands in the District of Columbia and its environs; before Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved Water, and Resource Conservation, on 24 June 1986. A report.

D. Georgetown Act administrative procedures, discussion of a memorandum to members from Secretary.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Federal Aviation Agency

CFA 31/JUL/86-1, Dulles Airport. Passenger terminal planning studies.

B. Department of State, International Center

CFA 31/JUL/86-2, Van Ness and Reno Road, N. W. Revised design for new security and maintenance facility. (Previous CFA 12/JUN/86-4)

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 31/JUL/86-4, Canadian Chancery. Design of security gates and fencing.

D. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 31/JUL/86-10, Washington Monument Grounds, German-American Friendship Garden. Final design and planting schedule. (Previous CFA 19/FEB/85-1)

E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-90, 409 12th Street, S. W. Material samples for new office building. (Final plans approved 17 April 1986)

b. S.L. 86-115, 901 D Street, S. W., Aerospace Building. Final working drawings and material selection. (Previous S.L. 86-52)

c. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-159, 1206 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Satellite dish antenna on commercial building.

b. O.G. 86-171, -180, 1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Raze one-story additions and construct new addition on commercial building.

c. O.G. 86-172, 3025 P Street, N. W. Concept design for rear addition to residence.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, 31 July 1986

2. Old Georgetown Act (continued)

d. O.G. 86-176, 1233-1235 37th Street, N. W. Concept design for side addition to residence.

e. O.G. 86-193, -194, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Raze two-story apartment building and construct new office/apartment structure.

f. Appendix II.

F. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 31/JUL/86-9, George and Ira Gershwin medal. Designs for obverse and reverse.

G. Office of Management and Budget

1. CFA 31/JUL/86-6, Report requested on draft legislation concerning preservation of portions of the Department of State Building.

2. CFA 31/JUL/86-5, H.J. Res. 504. Report on comment by NASA on legislation for a proposed Astronauts Memorial.

PM 1:00 III. LUNCHEON RECESS

PM 1:30 IV. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS (resumed)

H. District of Columbia Department of Public Works

CFA 31/JUL/86-7, Van Ness Street and Connecticut Avenue, N. W., University of the District of Columbia. Concept design for Phase III.

IV. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, 31 July 1986

I. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 31/JUL/86-8, Revised designs for sign program. (Previous CFA 12/JUN/86-3)

PM 2:30 V. INSPECTION

Smithsonian sign program revised mock-up, Constitution Avenue near 12th Street, N. W.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-80	3100 Macomb Street, N. W. Washington International School	New building and greenhouse renovation-Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of greenhouse renovation or new classroom building. Note is made that the projects have limited visibility from Rock Creek Park and that the proposed designs are harmonius with the existing school buildings. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended. See case S.L. 86-99.

S.L. 86-99	3100 Macomb Street, N. W. Washington International School	New building and greenhouse renovation-Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of greenhouse renovation or new classroom building. Note is made that the projects have limited visibility from Rock Creek Park and that the proposed designs are harmonious with the existing school buildings. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended. See case S.L. 86-80.

S.L. 86-111	217 F Street, N. E. Norman R. and Winfred F. Williams	Windows

ACTION: Submission is not in CFA jurisdiction.

S.L. 86-113	750 17th Street, N. W. Manufacturers Life	New office building

ACTION: No objection to concept proposal for new office building as shown on drawings received and dated 4 June 1986. While removal of proposed ornamental railing at top of building is advised, recommend retention and continued careful development of ornamental details elsewhere. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-114	424 3rd Street, N. E. United Baptist Church	Sidewalk

ACTION: Submission is not in CFA jurisdiction.

S.L. 86-116	1440 New York Avenue, N. W. Washington Building Limited	Banner

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for temporary banner (80 x 140), commemorating the Statue of Liberty, to be erected by 3 July and removed by 7 July 1986 according to enclosed drawing received and dated 17 June 1986.

S.L. 86-118	1706 Crestwood Drive, N. W. Pearl and George Dalley	Deck

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for rear deck provided new brick work matches existing house as closely as possible.

S.L. 86-119	201 Pennsylvania Avenue, S. E. Shannon and Luchs	Awnings

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for 2nd story awnings, provided they are mounted under ornamental panels and do not interfere with trim to sides of windows.

S.L. 86-120	2934 Macomb Street, N. W. Donna and Burkey Belser	Windows

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for changing windows on rear addition which has minimal visibility from public space and no affect on adjoining parkland.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-121	209 Pennsylvania Avenue, S. E. Mrs. Fields Cookies	Awning/sign change

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for recladding of existing awning as indicated in application dated 9 July 1986. Logo and lettering will be confined to valance only.

S.L. 86-122	700 Water Street, S. W.	Replacement signs

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for replacement of lettering for Casa Maria signs with similarly mounted letters reading El Torito only.

S.L. 86-124	2500 Calvert Street, N. W. Shoreham Hotel	Firestair addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the addition of a brick firestair at the exterior of the existing motel structure on the Shoreham Hotel grounds as shown in drawings received and dated 9 July 1986. Stair enclosure will duplicate existing materials and have minimum visibility from Rock Creek Park. Existing tree to be removed shall be replaced with new tree of like kind next to new stair tower.

S.L. 86-125	200 Massachusetts Avenue, N. E. Chevron USA, Inc.	Replacement sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for replacement sign as shown on drawing received and dated 23 July 1986 provided that: (1) Top of new sign will be no higher from ground than existing sign. (2) Support standard will be painted or enamelled the same color as the supports for the existing canopy. (3) Lighting level shall not exceed 50% of brightness common to standard installations built elsewhere.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-126	550 C Street, S. W. Donohoe Construction Company	Satellite dish

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for erection of satellite dish to be located next to south face of penthouse on roof. Dish, which will be painted light grey, will replace existing receiver mast.

S.L. 86-127	3100 Macomb Street, N. W. Washington International School	Greenhouse conversion

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for conversion of greenhouse to classroom use as shown in drawings received and dated 23 July 1986. Letter from applicant received 23 July verifies that no changes have been made to concept design approved 12 June 1986.

S.L. 86-128	700 Water Street, S. W. El Torito (formerly Casa Maria)	Awning/sign, lighting new door and outdoor seating

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed umbrellas and tables, lantern lights, new door to terrace and awning with lettering as shown on drawings received and dated 23 July 1986.

S.L. 86-129	1800 Shepherd Street, N. W. Mamadi Diane	3-story addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition and entrance porch as shown on supplementary drawings received and dated 28 July 1986. Stonework, roofing material and details shall match existing.

S.L. 86-131	441 4th Street, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz Companies	Construction sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed 4 by 8 foot construction sign as shown in sketch received and dated 25 July 1986. Sign will be removed upon completion of building. (See S.L. 86-132 and S.L. 86-133.)

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-132	441 4th Street, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz Companies	Construction sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed 4 by 8 foot construction sign as shown in sketch received and dated 25 July 1986. Sign will be removed upon completion of building. (See S.L. 86-131 and S.L. 86-133.)

S.L. 86-133	441 4th Street, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz Companies	Construction sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed 4 by 8 foot construction sign as shown in sketch received and dated 25 July 1986. Sign will be removed upon completion of building. (See S.L. 86-131 and S.L. 86-132.)

OLD GEORGETOWN ACT SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-125	1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Alice M. Craven Trust	Addition

ACTION: Void. Superseded by O.G. 86-180.

O.G. 86-140	3213 Volta Place, N. W. Blatt Berg	Addition - Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of proposed alteration and one floor addition. Recommend design development. Note that approval is based on supplemental drawing received and dated 27 May 1986.

O.G. 86-142	1515 & 1517 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Alain and Claudine Chetrit	Alteration

ACTION: Void. Superseded by 86-177.

O.G. 86-177	1517 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Alain Chetrit	Storefront Alteration

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for alterations to commercial structure as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 14 July 1986. Recommend adjusting base of show window to line up with lower stiles or panels of doors.

O.G. 86-143	3524 Reservoir Road, N. W. Scott Stinson	4-story townhouse - Conceptual

ACTION: Void. Superseded by O.G. 86-154.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-154	3524 Reservoir Road, N. W. Scott Stinson	4-story townhouse - Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept designs for pair of houses as shown on drawings received and dated 14 May 1986. Submit working drawings and landscape plan for final review by CFA prior to start of construction. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended.

O.G. 86-145	3520 Reservoir Road, N. W. Steven Brown	4-story townhouse - Conceptual

ACTION: Void. Superseded by case O.G. 86-153.

O.G. 86-153	3520 Reservoir Road, N. W. Steven Brown	4-story townhouse - Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept designs for pair of houses as shown on drawings received and dated 14 May 1986. Submit working drawings and landscape plan for final review by CFA prior to start of construction. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended.

O.G. 86-149	907 30th Street, N. W. Rosewood Georgetown Joint Venture	Public space design

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed improvements to public space as shown on drawings received and dated 8 May 1986.

O.G. 86-152	3530 Water Street, N. W. Potomac Boat Club	2nd floor addition - Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for addition and renovation of existing boating facility as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 20 May 1986. Recommend that second floor of addition facing Water Street be recessed and clad in wood shingles instead of brick. Submit working drawings for final review by CFA prior to exterior construction.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-155	1677-79 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Aramus Corporation	Repairs

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed work visible from public space allowing the replacement of windows and trim to match existing, to repair stucco, and to resurface patches as shown on plans filed with the Commission of Fine Arts and attached hereto. [The Commission additionally has no objection to the resurfacing with wood siding a reconstructed six-foot-eight-inch deep addition to the rear of 1675 Wisconsin Avenue, subject to the proper Reconstruction and Repair permit being issued to the satisfaction of the District of Columbia Government.] See O.G. 86-156.

O.G. 86-156	1675 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Joseph Mobassalef	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed work visible from public space allowing the replacement of windows and trim to match existing, to repair stucco, and to resurface patches as shown on plans filed with the Commission of Fine Arts and attached hereto. The Commission additionally has no objection to the resurfacing with wood siding a reconstructed six-foot-eight-inch deep addition to the rear of 1675 Wisconsin Avenue, subject to the proper Reconstruction and Repairs permit being issued to the satisfaction of the District of Columbia Government.] See O.G. 86-155.

O.G. 86-158	1601 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Chevron USA, Inc.	Pole-mounted sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for pole-mounted, internally-illuminated sign depicted as Alternate design on drawings received and dated 21 May 1986. The Alternate scheme will have the logo and price panels mounted at the same level. As the location of this gas station is adjacent to a residential neighborhood, the intensity of internal illumination should be approximately half that of standard installation for other locations. Recommend painting proposed pole standard the same color as existing canopy supports.

O.G. 86-150	3147 O Street, N. W. Joe Conzeri	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations indicated on supplemental drawings dated 14 July, provided that there will be no alteration or change to the existing brick work or shape of masonry openings at the ground floor, and that stucco will be omitted from proposed work. Applicant has agreed to these changes.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-161	3000 M Street, N. W. Marvin Meyer	Signs

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for sign reading "Georgetown Marbury Hotel" to be mounted over arcade on M Street, provided that letters not exceed 15" in height. Also no objection to signs mounted at second floor level on east and west (end) elevations, provided that signs not exceed 3' x 4' in size. Awning is not recommended. Awning over driveway entrance on M Street is unsuited to character and proportion of opening.

O.G. 86-163	3700 O Street, N. W. Georgetown University	Fence and gates

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed fence and gate as shown on drawings received and dated 24 June 1986. Proposed ornamental ironwork for fence will be mounted in a masonry base which will continue the stonework of the adjacent walls.

O.G. 86-164	2514 Mill Street, N. W. Winfield Scott	Renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and renovation as shown on supplementary drawings received and dated 22 July 1986.

O.G. 86-165	2725 P Street, N. W. Mr. and Mrs. Fred J. Maroon	Window replacement

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new casement windows which will differ from the existing casements by opening in rather than out.

O.G. 86-167	3000 M Street, N. W. Taj International	Awning/Sign

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed awning/sign as shown on drawing received and dated 11 June 1986. Recommend problem of identifying entrance be resolved by increasing the size of the lanterns flanking the entrance and/or by some device other than an awning.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-169	3314 P Street, N. W. Margaret L. Dickey	Rear stoop and stair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed wood stoop and rail as shown on drawings received and dated 11 June 1986.

O.G. 86-170	1227 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. George Katinas	Awning/sign

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed awning/sign. Resubmit shed-type awning with valance. Lettering shall be confined to valance only.

O.G. 86-173	1530 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Suter's Tavern, Inc.	Alterations and repair

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed alterations to commercial structure as indicated in application dated 17 June 1986. Drawings submitted along with supplementary designs are not appropriate to the character of Georgetown or to this simple, brick, late 19th century commercial building. Recommend study of frosted or etched glass for windows and projecting bays and stained or painted glass for transoms.

O.G. 86-174	1529 33rd Street, N. W. Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Zimmerman	New dormer: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of dormer window as proposed. Recommend narrowing of glazed area and submission of working drawings for approval of Commission when ready.

O.G. 86-175	1344 30th Street, N. W. Reynolds residence	Greenhouse addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed second floor greenhouse as shown on supplemental drawing received and dated 14 July 1986.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-178	1229 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. 1229 Wisconsin Avenue Associates	Building front alteration

ACTION: Void. Superseded by O.G. 86-195.

O.G. 86-179	2735 Olive Street, N. W. Washington International School	Renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed renovation work as shown in working drawings received and dated 18 June 1986. Letter from applicant dated 12 June described intended changes to approved concept. These changes have been noted and approved.

O.G. 86-181	1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Alice M. Craven Trust	Raze building

ACTION: Void. Duplicate submission documents. See O.G. 86-171 for appropriate Action.

O.G. 86-182	3328 Reservoir Road, N. W. Susan Huffard	Deck and air conditioning

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed masonry work, alterations and new decking as shown on drawing received and dated 25 June 1986.

O.G. 86-67	3600 M Street, N. W. D. C. Realty Corporation	Addition, alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition and alterations to the Car Barn. Working drawings received and dated 2 July 1986 and letter from applicant dated 30 June 1986 indicate that there have been no deviations from the previously approved concept design.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-183	1715 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Mr. and Mrs. Yoshimoto	Fence

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed wood fencing shown on drawing received and dated 2 July 1986.

O.G. 86-184	1355 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. George Alasgines	Projecting bay

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Proposed addition of projecting show window would not be appropriate.

O.G. 86-185	1513 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. George Alasgines	Storefront alteration

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Proposed alterations to storefront as shown on drawing received and dated 2 July 1986 are inappropriate to character of existing building and the historic district.

O.G. 86-186	2808 P Street, N. W. Jane Chase Joyce	Exterior replacement

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to street elevation as shown on drawing received and dated 2 July 1986.

O.G. 86-187	1000 Potomac Street, N. W. Jones Lang Wootton	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign having individually-mounted letters as shown on drawing received and dated 2 July 1986.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-188	2715 M Street, N. W. Carol Abry	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign shown on drawing received and dated 2 July 1986.

O.G. 86-190	2511 Q Street, N. W. Rock Creek Gardens L.P.	New patios and canopy addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new patios and doors and canopy addition as shown on drawings received and dated 2 July 1986. When the need occurs, recommend submission of designs for security grilles and fencing at new patios.

O.G. 86-191	1338 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Mathew E. Donahue	Storefront alteration

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Proposed changes to existing show windows would not be appropriate to character of historic building.

O.G. 86-192	2001 Wisconsin Avenue 2001 Wisconsin Avenue Associates	Terracing and landscaping

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed terracing and landscape work as shown in drawings received and dated 9 July 1986.

O.G. 86-195 HPA. 86-579	1229 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Esprit De Corp	Building front alteration

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. No objection to the general concept of improving the windows and doors. Installation of sheets of butt-jointed glass and removal of the muntins and glazing bars would be inappropriate because the windows were designed to help reduce the building scale at the Commission's insistence. Recommend submission of a design more in keeping with the style of the existing building and character of the historic district if changes are to be considered.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-196	1325 30th Street, N. W. Phillip Abraham	Patio, pool and doors

ACTION: Void. Superseded by O.G. 86-201.

O.G. 86-201	1325 30th Street, N. W. Phillip Abraham	Patio, pool and doors

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for alteration and renovation to house, including new front entrance to match 1327 30th Street, basement addition with French doors, and swimming pool. Approval does not include proposed changes to existing brick wall at sidewalk which will be submitted at a later date. Installation of the pools for both 1325 and 1327 will not include removal in part or whole, permanently or temporarily, the existing wall at sidewalk. Stability of adjacent house should be carefully protected and monitored.

O.G. 86-197	1327 30th Street, N. W. Phillip Abraham	Patio, pool and doors

ACTION: Void. Superseded by O.G. 86-202.

O.G. 86-202	1327 30th Street, N. W. Phillip Abraham	Patio, pool and doors

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for alteration and renovation to house, including swimming pool and basement addition with French doors. Installation of the pools for both 1325 and 1327 will not include removal in part or whole, permanently or temporarily, the existing wall at sidewalk. Stability of adjacent house should be protected and monitored.

O.G. 86-203	2821 N Street, N. W. Maureen Brennen Thomas Brock	Sun deck

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for deck not visible from public space.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-200	1633 31st Street, N. W.	Fence

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for temporary and permanent fences shown in drawings received and dated 9 July 1986.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

31 July 1986

The meeting was convened at 10:10 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Frederick E. Hart Hon. Diane Wolf
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue A. Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Patrick Tribe

At the beginning of the meeting the Chairman noted the absence of a quorum, and said the recommendations of those present would be transmitted to the full commission through the minutes, to be ratified, with whatever discussion was necessary, at the September meeting.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 12 June 1986 minutes. Miss Wolf had some questions concerning submissions made at the meeting, but not pertaining to the minutes as written, and approval was unanimously recommended.

B. Dates of next meetings, recommended to remain as:

18 September 1986 (Thursday)

16 October 1986 (Thursday)

C. Statement by Neil H. Porterfield, Vice Chairman, on S. 2522 a bill to provide standards for placement of commemorative works on certain federal lands in the District of Columbia and its environs; before Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved Water, and Resource Conservation, on 24 June 1986.(A report) Staff member Sue Kohler recalled that the members had received copies of the bill and a draft of Commission testimony in advance of the hearing and she reported that there had been no adverse comments. In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Porterfield had given the testimony at the hearing, and this report was being made to confirm that fact for the record. Exhibit A, A-1

Miss Wolf asked to read a letter from Lewis Sharp, curator and administrator of the American Wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, to Senator Wallop, chairman of the subcommittee before which the hearing was held, on the matter of memorials in Washington. In his letter Mr. Sharp suggested that to avoid overcrowding the city with statuary, all public art should be reviewed periodically to see whether it was still deemed worthy of a place in the national capital; if not, it could be stored, possibly in a public park where it could still be seen. The Chairman commented that there were not only aesthetic but political dimensions to memorials, and that the dismantling and moving of whole memorials could be an expensive proposition, which the special interest group funding the memorial would be unlikely to want to finance; but that the idea could provide a helpful function, and he suggested Mr. Sharp's letter be entered into the record. As it was, however, addressed to Senator Wallop, no action could be taken by the Commission. Exhibit A-2

D. Georgetown Act administrative procedures, discussion of a memorandum to members from the Secretary. The Secretary recalled the contents of this memorandum, prepared in response to a letter from the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, recommending changes in Georgetown administrative procedures. He said that while the thrust of the recommendations was good, the staff had prepared substitute suggestions that would more accurately reflect Board and Commission meeting schedules and staff time. He said that with the Commission's permission, he would like to try these out for a few months to see if they work before adopting them formally. Miss Wolf thought the Georgetown Board agendas should be mailed to the Citizens Association and the Foundation as originally suggested, rather than just made available, but the Secretary did not think that was a good idea because of the uncertainty of mail delivery and the possible suggestion that the Commission was giving preferential treatment to these organizations. Exhibit B

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Federal Aviation Agency

CFA 31/JUL/86-1, Dulles Airport. Passenger terminal planning studies. The Assistant Secretary said this submission was for major

planning studies involving additions to the airport complex. He said the original terminal building, designed by Eero Saarinen, would be kept intact as the architectural centerpiece of the airport, but a system for extensive expansion had been developed as there was a growing demand for it.

David Childs from Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, was then introduced. He said his firm had been working closely with the FAA and that this was a vast project of which SOM's work was only a part. He introduced design partner Marilyn Taylor to discuss Phase I of the project. Mrs. Taylor said there would eventually be six new midfield concourses, each with twenty-four gates; Phase I would include the first of these, and about five years later, the second, accommodating a total of four million annual enplanements. As the existing mobile lounges cannot accommodate the increasing number of shorter flights and transfers, the midfield concourses would be connected to the main terminal by a loop-type subway system or people-mover. Mrs. Taylor said Phase I would also include improvements to the main terminal baggage area in the lower level and expansion of the FIS (customs and immigration) to a new facility to the east, which would appear as an extension of the plinth of the main building.

Mr. Childs said that eventually four bays would be added to each side of the main terminal, in accordance with Saarinen's original master plan. People would continue to enter through the main building, and through some reconfiguration of interior space,go down escalators to the people-mover and out to the new midfield concourses. Thus the entrance experience through the original terminal would be preserved. The new concourses would be long, low buildings with a higher central feature, containing the people-mover station and two levels of shops and services, with an open oculus to connect the platform and concourse areas visually. A clerestory would bring ample natural light to the long arms. Extensive use of clear glass and a simple design would complement the original building. The central section would be 160 feet square, the arms each 700 feet long and 104 feet wide.

Mr. Childs said the master plan would keep the dominance of the main building and that all new construction would be low; he noted that there were already other small buildings on the site, some temporary. He went through the progression of plans for the expansion, from the concept of a single building behind the main terminal to the need for more and the development of the final scheme where six concourses, in two rows of three would flank the main axis from the terminal out on the existing apron area and keep the central vista and other important views open. The Chairman suggested that this concept came from the plan of Marly in France and Mr. Childs agreed. He noted that the problem of symmetry could arise since the concourses would be built in phases; however, Mr. Childs expected the second building to follow the first within a few years, and a loop in the people-mover would allow it to flank the first concourse rather than be built behind it, thus keeping

the symmetrical placement.

The members had several questions for Mr. Childs. The Chairman asked if the new concourses would be seen from the approaches to the main terminal. Mr. Childs said it would be difficult to see them as they would be very low and about 1300 feet away from the terminal. He acknowledged that there were places on the approaches where these and other small buildings could be seen, but they would not be dominant elements in the landscape. Miss Wolf was concerned about the long distance passengers might have to walk--1400 feet--if they needed to get from one end of the new concourse to the other. She thought a moving sidewalk was a necessity. Mr. Childs said the corridors were too narrow to accommodate this (36 feet) and it would be difficult to increase the width of the arms because of the space needed to park the airplanes. Miss Wolf suggested moving the buildings farther apart but Mr. Childs said this was not feasible because of the position of the runways south of the terminal. All agreed that the walking distance was a problem, and Mr. Childs said he would study it further. As a final comment, Mr. Childs reported that there would be funds for sculpture and other art, probably about 3/4 to 1 percent of the budget.

Other than their reservations about the walking distances--which the Chairman noted, although of genuine concern, was not really in the Commission's jurisdiction--the members were pleased with the planning concept and agreed to recommend approval to the full Commission at the September meeting. Exhibit C

B. Department of State, International Center

CFA 31/JUL/86-2, Van Ness and Reno Road, N. W. Revised design for new security and maintenance facility. Staff member Jeffrey Carson showed drawings from the previous submission, noting that the Commission had asked for a reduction in height, and said that new drawings would show that a floor had been taken out, the building lowered on its site, and the program reduced by 25 percent. He introduced Michael Newell from the State Department and William Lenyk from the Leo A. Daly Company, architects, to discuss the changes that had been made. Mr. Lenyk showed the members a model of the Center, with existing and planned chanceries and the security and maintenance building in place, facing the central park. He said the FAR had been reduced from 1.5 to 1.1, in keeping with other buildings on the site, the height brought down, and dormers introduced to break up the mass of the roof. He showed elevations and a perspective drawing to show how the building related to the surrounding chanceries. He said 8 feet would be cut off the top of the hill and the building height reduced by 12 feet, making it 20 feet lower than the previous version. He said the tower was still 10 feet above the maximum permitted and would need a variance from NCPC, such as had been granted the Qatar Chancery nearby. Mr. Lenyk also showed material samples--red roof tile, cream colored precast concrete and pavers.

Miss Wolf did not think regrading the hill helped the building, and she did not think the design was in character with either the Intelsat headquarters or the buildings at the University of the District of Columbia. She said she did not like the addition of the dormers and would prefer a simple roof with gable ends. She also thought the building should be turned so that the open part of the L-shaped building would face the park. Mr. Lenyk said that, as oriented, the tower and visitor drop-off would face the park and the service and trash removal could be conveniently handled in the open area at the rear. If the massing were moved back, these functions would be difficult to accommodate and the building would not frame the park as well. The Chairman agreed, and he and Mr. Hart congratulated the architect for having been so responsive to the Commission's comments. The Chairman said he thought the building had a more welcoming aspect than before. He asked Mr. Lenyk about the function of the tower and was told that this would be a core area, with a lobby and elevators, and its large glazed areas would offer views of the park. The Chairman had one criticism: he thought the ribbon windows running around the building below the roof clashed with the weight-bearing aesthetic of the rest of the building. He suggested strengthening the mullions to bring these windows more in line with the others. Mr. Hart said he found the building much improved; the height had been brought down and he thought the dormers were successful in breaking up the mass of the roof. Miss Wolf asked the Chairman if he were bothered by the fact that this building differed in style from the others, and he replied that all the buildings were different, that there was no uniform style. Miss Wolf said she still did not find the design acceptable and would like to see a version with a gabled roof. The Chairman said he did not think the Commission could design the building for them; he did, however, ask the architects to consider the recommendations made at this meeting and come back in September, when the full Commission would review the design. Exhibit D

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 31/JUL/86-4, Canadian Chancery, design of security gates and fencing. The Assistant Secretary introduced James Rich from PADC who, in turn, introduced the architect, Arthur Erickson, to discuss his design. Mr. Erickson said he had made many studies for the gates, beginning with organic themes such as maple leaves and wheat, and progressing through a design based on the British flag to a more simple, geometric design formed of rectangular stainless steel sections with a mirror finish. The fence would be partially screened by planting. Mr. Erickson said the gates had to be more distinctive than the fence, and he thought the final design fulfilled this requirement but was still unobtrusive and picked up details from the building, especially the polished stainless steel door and window frames. The gates, 9 feet tall, would fold back and disappear into the ground during normal business hours. The Chairman questioned Mr. Erickson on the upkeep involved when using a mirror finish;

Mr. Erickson said he had never had a problem with this and liked the finish because it tended to make the object disappear. Mr. Hart asked if he would consider using a brushed finish on the fence, and Mr. Erickson replied that he would prefer not to mix the two finishes, as the polished surface needed to be consistent with the detailing throughout the rest of the building.

Mr. Rich said PADC had not formally reviewed the design, but their design committee had commented on the brightness of the mirror finish and also on the inconsistency of the design of the fence and gates. The Chairman said a mock-up of the pickets might be helpful, and Mr. Rich said PADC was planning to do this. The members present had no objections to the design of either the fence or gates, but agreed that a mock-up of the pickets should be seen. Exhibit E

D. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 31/JUL/86-10 Washington Monument Grounds, German-American Friendship Garden. Final design and planting schedule. (Previous CFA 19/FEB/85-1) Mr. Carson said these were final plans for a project that had been seen several times by the Commission; he located the site, on the south side of Constitution Avenue at the 16th Street right-of-way, on an aerial photograph. He explained the previous submissions to the members who, with the exception of the Chairman, had not been on the Commission at the time. He said the design had been approved with some reservations in February 1985 and read the letter sent at that time, which stated the Commission's opposition to retaining the parking lot existing on the site, and to listing individual or corporate donors' names on any memorial located on federal park lands. If further consideration were given to such a listing, the letter said, the names would best be inscribed in the stone of the paved terraces. Mr. Carson gave the members a maintenance schedule for the plants to be used, and said the Commission had requested that there be no ornamental grasses used, because of the formality of the setting, and that the dead growth of the perennial plants be removed in late fall.

Park Service representative John Parsons was introduced and commented first on the parking lot. He said the Park Service was studying the possibility of underground parking on the Ellipse or fringe parking, and until one of these was implemented, the parking lot would have to remain. Mr. Hart asked if the Friendship Garden was considered part of the Washington Monument Grounds plan and was told that it was.

Landscape architect James van Sweden was then introduced to review the plans and answer questions. He discussed the materials for the circular terraces and pools and showed samples. The coping for both the terraces and pools would be dark grey granite and the paving would be light grey cobblestones. On the coping of one fountain would be a

quotation from Jefferson; on the other, one from Goethe. These would be inscribed in 3 inch letters. On the coping of both terraces the donors' names would be inscribed in ½ inch letters. Mr. van Sweden said the planting beds would be slightly mounded, and he showed color photographs of the plants to be used. In answer to a question from Miss Wolf, he said that something would be in bloom during all seasons, although winter would be sparse, with evergreens and witch hazel providing the primary color. The perennial beds would be mulched. Miss Wolf thought it very important that dead plants be removed in the winter and that the plantings be formal and preferably of one color; she thought a strong statement should be made because of the monumental character of the area. The Chairman agreed on the need for a certain degree of formality but thought that such a small space was probably too small to lend itself to an extremely formal treatment without looking pretentious and silly. He thought Mr. Porterfield should see the planting plan before any final approval was given.

The inscription of the donors' names was then discussed. Both Miss Wolf and Mr. Hart felt strongly that no donors' names should appear on any memorial on the Mall and noted that there were none on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial although it had been built with private contributions. The Chairman commented that the Commission had not been involved in the original decision to list the names and had not been pleased with the idea when it was first presented. He told Mr. Parsons that the full Commission would be asked to ratify the advice given at this meeting, but that questions still remained, particularly concerning the names, that would have to be resolved. He said we would welcome any information the Park Service could supply about possible precedents. In answer to a question from Mr. Parsons, the Chairman said he did not believe the Commission would have objection to proceeding with construction drawings for the terraces, pools, and other garden elements, as these did not involve the donor credit issue at this stage. Exhibit F

E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-90, 409 12th Street, S. W. Material samples for new office building. (Final plans approved 17 April 1986) Mr. Carson recalled that this building will be adjacent to the Portal Site, soon to be developed, and said the submission was an addendum to the working drawings approved in April and concerned material samples only. He introduced architect Arthur Cotton Moore, who recalled that the Commission had asked him to look into the use of limestone rather than cast stone on the project. He said he had determined that it would be too expensive, and he was seeking approval of a very dense, finely finished cast stone that had been used on a number of high quality Washington buildings recently. He showed photographs of the buildings, including the new Regency Hotel,

and a sample of the stone, noting that his building would be a small one, next to the railroad tracks, in an area that was not particularly desirable. The members thought the cast stone very handsome for this use but emphasized to Mr. Moore that he was not to construe this as permission to use it on the Portal Site building, for which he will also be the architect. The Chairman said no formal approval could be given because of the lack of a quorum, but those present had no objection and Mr. Moore could take his chances that the full Commission would agree and proceed on this basis if he wished. Exhibit G

b. S.L. 86-115, 901 D Street, S. W., Aerospace Building. Final working drawings and material selection. (Previous S.L. 86-52) The Assistant Secretary said the Commission had seen several possible material choices during the last submission, and he introduced the architect Jacquelin Robertson to discuss his final choices. Mr. Robertson showed slides of several Washington Beaux-Arts buildings and said that although his would be a new building on a new street, he wanted to pick up on details and organization of buildings of this period; he said the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, in particular, had been an inspiration for his design. He also showed slides of the new buildings in the Federal Center and L'Enfant Plaza areas (near his building) and pointed out the mixture of very light and darker coloration. He said he wanted his building to be a transition between the two, and it would have, as originally submitted, a dark base and a light upper section. There had been two changes: for budget and color reasons, the use of natural stone had been eliminated and cast stone substituted, and the glass in the upper section had been changed to a light blue; windows in the base section would continue to have reflective glass, as shown previously. Mr. Robertson said he felt it was important that the base not be too dark, and he had found a high quality medium grey cast stone that he thought was actually a better color than the granites available. As limestone was too expensive for the upper section and he wanted to use a very light color, he was suggesting a light, finely-finished cast stone instead. He showed samples of these and of the proposed blue glass, and a slide of a building in Ottawa where the glass had been used. The Commission looked at the samples in the daylight and had no objection; the Assistant Secretary said the working drawings had been inspected by the staff and conformed with the preliminaries previously approved. The Chairman said the members present would recommend approval to the full Commission at the September meeting. Exhibit G

c. Appendix 1, approved.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-159, 1206 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Satellite dish antenna on commercial building. Mr. Carson showed photographs of this already existing dish antenna, mounted on a new building in an alley behind Wisconsin Avenue. He said it was not visible from the

avenue but could be seen from Prospect Street, across a parking lot. He reported that the Georgetown Board had visited the site and he read their report, which noted that although the antenna was visible across the parking lot, the lot was by nature and location only temporary and any new construction there would further limit the visibility of the antenna. The report also noted that the structure on which the dish was mounted was not a historic building, and further, that most of the rooftops surrounding it had antennas or ducts of various sizes and heights, some visible from as much as a block away. The Board recommended that, in this case, the Commission approve the dish, recommending that to reduce its visibility it be painted a light grey. Mr. Carson added that the D. C. Building Code was not yet specific on regulations for these antennas, only on the structures that support them.

Mrs. Frank, representing the Citizens Association, said her organization was opposed on principle to satellite dishes in Georgetown. She pointed out that even though not visible from public space they were visible to neighbors. She thought this case might set a precedent if approved. The members agreed that they were reluctant to approve them in an historic district, and the Chairman said the Commission would have to proceed on a case-by-case basis. Miss Wolf thought this one was very visible from Prospect Street and should be disapproved. The Chairman thought, however, that as it was not visible from any major view and was on a new commercial building, it was one of the least objectionable; he said he would like to back the Georgetown Board in its recommendation since a lot of thought had been given to it. Mr. Hart agreed, and the Chairman said the burden of proof would continue to be on those who choose to erect these antennas. Exhibit G

b. O.G. 86-171, -180, 1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Raze one-story additions and construct new addition on commercial building. Mr. Carson said this was a dual submission: a request for razing and new replacement construction. He read the Georgetown Board's report, which recalled an earlier request to raze a two-story 19th century addition as well, a request that had been turned down with a recommendation for further study. The most recent scheme reviewed by the Board kept the two-story addition and replaced the more recent one-story addition with new construction that, in the Board's opinion, would be an improvement over the present dilapidated condition. A representative from the architects, Fisher/Gordon, was introduced and told the members that the D. C. Historic Preservation Board had approved the razing and the concept of a one-story addition. There were no questions and no objections; approval of both submissions will be recommended to the full Commission in September. Exhibit G

c. O.G. 86-172, 3025 P Street, N. W. Concept design for rear addition to residence. The Assistant Secretary said the Board had reviewed designs for this addition several times. The first would have removed the back 13 feet of a service wing of this early 19th century

house for a 2½ story addition that would have been considerably larger than the front section of the original house. The Board thought this inconsistent with the recently issued policy on additions to Georgetown houses, and at the next meeting, after the Board had made a site inspection and confirmed this view, the architect submitted revised plans which kept the entire service wing, reduced the height and bulk somewhat, and softened the character of the elevation details. The Board agreed to accept the footprint, but was still concerned about the height and the fact that the form and the elevation facing the street essentially duplicated that of the original house, which the Board did not consider appropriate.

The Assistant Secretary noted that the addition was being requested because the family needed more space, not for speculative reasons. He said there had been considerable neighborhood interest in the project, resulting in seven letters to the Commission in favor and three against the addition. He then introduced the architect, Richard Stauffer, who showed the members drawings of the designs seen by the Georgetown Board and a new one,much reduced in height and of a similar character but not mimicing the main house. He also showed photographs of the street and views from the side yard and alley.

The members discussed the addition and the questions it raised. Miss Wolf read the policy on additions to houses and said she thought the addition went against the policy and that it would be quite visible, especially when walking east on P Street. The Chairman said he thought an addition could be accommodated, and said the real issues were the height and the mocking of the original house; he thought the latest design was a step in the right direction. He asked for comment from the community. Mrs. Frank, representing the Citizens Association of Georgetown, said their president, Mrs. Graff, had at first spoken out against any addition to this house, but later decided that a modest addition would be acceptable. Mrs. Barnes, a neighbor, said she did not object to an addition but would prefer a flat roof as it would impinge less on her property. Mrs. Boyd, representing the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, said they supported the Board's policy on additions to small houses and added that Isabel Shannon had asked her to say that the ANC also supported it; her recommendation at this point was that the project should be sent back to the Goergetown Board for further review since they had not seen Mr. Stauffer's newest, and much lower, version. The members agreed that this was the course to pursue. Exhibit G

d. O.G. 86-176, 1233-1235 37th Street, N. W. Concept design for side addition to residence. The Assistant Secretary said this would be infill construction by Georgetown University, on a side yard adjoining a University-owned house. There was a house on the site

until its demolition in 1959. He said the Georgetown Board, with that fact in mind and after a site inspection, had no objection to the concept of the addition, noting that the street consisted of an almost unbroken row of two-story houses of varying materials and dates of construction. They had requested, however, that the new addition be set back from the street about 10 feet to differentiate the old and new buildings and asked that it have the appearance of a separate house, perhaps through placing a door in the main facade. The architect, William Cochran, argued against the setback, pointing out that the other houses in the block come right out to the street; he also said that since the addition and the existing house will be connected, the setback would cause him problems with the interior spaces.

Miss Wolf again quoted from the policy on additions to Georgetown houses, saying that an addition should not double the size of a house, and she thought there was no question that this one did. She thought the open space should be left, and said there was an existing small structure on the lot that would have to have a demolition permit before new construction was approved. Mrs. Boyd thought the addition was a very substantial one and asked that it be sent back to the Georgetown Board for further review. The Chairman said there were really two ways of looking at this construction--as an addition or as a new attached house. If considered as a house, he wondered if there would be any objection to its size. He said that given the consistency of the block, new construction could be seen as an improvement, filling the "missing tooth" along the row. He thought the fact that it was connected inside by doors to the existing house made no visual difference, from public space, and he disagreed with the Board's suggestion that it be set back from the existing house; he thought this would only intensify the perception of it as an oversized addition. It could well have its door, even if not used, but the door could be along the side facade. Mrs. Boyd thought it should be decided whether a house or an addition was being considered, and the members present agreed that the project should be returned to the Board for further review with these questions in mind.

Exhibit G

e. O.G. 86-193, -194, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Raze two-story apartment building and construct new office/apartment structure.

The Assistant Secretary commented that this project had been reviewed by both the Georgetown Board and the Commission, and he referred to the Board's report, which recalled the Commission's action in December 1985 approving the concept of a new building but with specific recommendations concerning the landscaping, roof and cornice design, and additional setbacks. Subsequently, any further action was deferred pending the D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board's action on the demolition request. When the request was approved, the Board said it would accept the demolition providing a suitable replacement could be designed that would retain the scale and relationship to the adjacent small houses, the side yards, setback from the street, and the old rock outcroppings.

When the Board looked at the design, revised to reflect the Commission's recommendations, it felt that it was still too intrusive and not respectful of the site or surrounding elements.

The architect, Shalom Baranes, and the developer, Peter Schwartz, said they had done just what the Commission asked, and they read from the December meeting transcript and then showed old and new drawings. Mr. Hart said it would be very difficult for him to make a decision in this case, because he wanted to be fair to the applicant and at the same time support the recommendations of the Georgetown Board. The Chairman agreed, but he said that the overall effect of the design was the determining factor, not following the Commission's recommendations line by line. Miss Wolf thought the revised design still showed too much building on the site.

The Chairman asked for comments by the community. Mrs. Boyd reviewed the circumstances of the District government's demolition approval, and Mrs. Frank read the ANC's response to the decision--a request that the question be reopened so that all Board members could read the transcript of the meeting and vote. Mrs. Boyd read a letter from Wynant Vanderpool, president of the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, requesting denial of the demolition permit because of the destruction of open space and scale that would result, and she said the Citizens Association of Georgetown had endorsed this letter. The ANC also passed a resolution against demolition. A letter from Robert Lyle, curator of the Georgetown collections at the Georgetown Library and long-time Georgetown resident, was read, opposing the demolition.

The Chairman said lack of a quorum prevented a decision at this time, and while the Commission wanted to be fair, it was also true that people and ideas change, and he thought the next step was to produce a design acceptable to the Board so that they would recommend a demolition permit, and then bring that design to the full Commission in September.

Exhibit G

f. Appendix II, approved.

F. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 31/JUL/86-9, George and Ira Gershwin medal. Designs for obverse and reverse. Mrs. Kohler introduced George Schafer from the Mint to show the members designs for this medal. On the obverse were profile portraits, one placed behind the other; and on the reverse, two bars of music with the words, "Shining star and inspiration - Worthy of a mighty nation" in Ira Gershwin's hand. Mr. Schafer said the Mint had worked with the Gershwin family on the design, and with Daniel Boorstin, Librarian of Congress, since the Library's music collections include many of the Gershwin scores. There were no serious objections to the portraits, but the design of the reverse was not considered acceptable by Miss Wolf nor

by Mr. Hart, who suggested that a competition limited to sculptors and medallic artists be held for both the obverse and reverse (since they could not be separated) with designs solicited through the American Society of Medalists. He said it would cost the Mint about $2500 to pay a professional to design the medal. Mr. Hart asked about time considerations, and Mr. Schafer said there was no deadline, but there was the family to consider, and in this case, as in others, the Mint had worked closely with Gershwin family members on the design. He thought it would be difficult if the winning design were selected by a professional jury, for the family and friends to get involved in the design process. Mr. Hart and Miss Wolf thought too much emphasis was being placed on the family's involvement; thought a national medal was an honor and in the interest of the family and the nation, the design should be the best possible. The Chairman thought this was an ideal situation in which to try a competition: there was no deadline; the medal would honor two men for their contributions to one of the arts; and the project involved the participation of the Librarian of Congress. Mr. Schafer was asked to take these recommendations to the Mint. Exhibit H

(The agenda order was altered at this point in consideration of waiting applicants, and the submissions from the Office of Management and Budget placed at the end.)

H. District of Columbia Department of Public Works

CFA 31/JUL/86-7, Van Ness Street and Connecticut Avenue, N. W., University of the District of Columbia. Concept design for Phase III. The Assistant Secretary said this submission was for two buildings in the continuing development of the campus and he showed a site plan, pointing out the relationship of the University to the Intelsat Headquarters and the International Center development. He said the siting conformed to the Master Plan and the architectural style was similar to other buildings on the campus. He recalled that the members had been sent information on the project previous to the meeting. Bernard Quarterman from the District's Department of Public Works was then introduced. Mr. Quarterman said Phase II and III would complete the development of the campus; he said the work had been coordinated with the State Department, because of the adjacent International Center, and that the plans had recently received a favorable reaction from the Planning Commission. He introduced architect Charles Bryant from Bryant & Bryant to discuss the building and landscaping plans. Mr. Bryant said the cluster form was being continued, as requested, and the materials would be the same as used elsewhere on the campus. He noted that it was a city campus, which precluded a great amount of open space, but said as much landscaping would be introduced as possible. He showed renderings of the proposed buildings, one to be used for fine arts classrooms and faculty and the other for laboratory purposes; then the members looked at a large model of the campus and discussed the new proposals

with Mr. Bryant. He said the pavers would be earthern in color and the buildings constructed of a warm color precast with shadow grey glass--the same as those already built. There were no objections, the design was considered completely consistent with what was there already and the Chairman told Mr. Bryant that approval would be recommended to the full Commission in September. Exhibit I

I. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 31/JUL/86-8, Revised designs for sign program. (Previous CFA 12/JUN/86-3) The Assistant Secretary recalled the discussion and inspection of mock-ups at the June meeting and said the signs had been restudied and new mock-ups erected for the members to inspect. He introduced Phillip Reiss from the Smithsonian who told the members that his office had been looking at a great many signs all over the city since June in an effort to make theirs the best possible. John Jameson, assistant secretary of the Smithsonian, was then introduced. He commented on the fact that visitors really do not know their way around the Mall, said he would like to lend his support to the new sign program, and added that he appreciated the Commission's help in this project. Mary Grace Potter than gave the members some brief background material on the project. She said it had begun three years ago as a design project at The George Washington University, and she said that the students had liked red as a background color because it carried well and related to the color of the Castle building. She recalled that the Bicentennial signs had been blue with a white logo. She showed slides to prove that the blue background signs did not show up, but as the slides were underexposed they did not give a good idea of the actual visibility. The Chairman said there was no doubt that a red sign would show up more than a blue one (the rationale behind stop signs, exit and emergency signs), and that neon could provide the greatest visibility of all, but he noted that at the previous meeting the Commission had found this color inappropriate for the Mall and thought that the size, clarity and brightness of the lettering were more important than the background color as far as legibility was concerned. He and the other members did tell Ms. Potter that they were happy to see that the bases had been changed from chrome to bronze. Miss Wolf did not like the vertical orientation of the signs; she thought a horizontal format would be more dignified and would not obscure the buildings as much. Mr. Hart asked if the Park Service was involved in the sign program and if there was a possibility for a total signage program. John Parsons, who was present at the meeting, said the Park Service was involved, and he added that about five years ago NCPC had taken on the project of coordinating Park Service, GSA, National Gallery and Smithsonian signs, but there was no funding and nothing had happened. He agreed with the Smithsonian that new Mall signs were needed. Mr. Hart said he thought the signs should emphasize the dignity of the national capital, that they should be consistent with the quality of the monumental core of the city.

The Chairman told the Smithsonian representatives that the members would look at the mock-ups, but emphasized again the inappropriateness of using red on the Mall. He said that because of the lack of a quorum, no action could be taken at this time. Exhibit J

(The Chairman went back to item II.G on the agenda, which had not been discussed.)

G. Office of Management and Budget

1. CFA 31/JUL/86-6, Report requested on draft legislation concerning preservation of portions of the Department of State Building. Mrs. Kohler said this draft legislation, prepared by the State Department, was for the purpose of protecting the museum character of certain rooms, such as the Diplomatic Reception Room and others, and was patterned on similar legislation in effect for the White House. It would differ, however, in allowing the Secretary and Curator more flexibility in acquiring, lending, and disposing of items and would also provide for insuring the entire collection. Mrs. Kohler said the staff had talked with people in the State Department about the legislation and was satisfied that its provisions had been carefully considered and were in the Department's best interest. There were no objections by those members present to this draft form. Exhibit K

2. CFA 31/JUL/86-5, H.J. Res. 504. Report on comment by NASA on legislation for a proposed Astronauts Memorial. Mrs. Kohler said this had not been circulated to members before the meeting because there had not been enough time between the date of receipt and the due date. She said the Commission had not yet been asked to review the legislation, and this request asked only for comments on NASA's report on it. She said NASA's report said they would prefer not to comment on or express preference for any particular memorial; it also noted several other memorial proposals to honor the astronauts, particularly the Challenger crew. In the absence of the Chairman and in view of the time constraints, the staff had consulted with Mr. Porterfield, who thought there was no reason for the Commission to object to NASA's comments. The staff then reported this to OMB. The members present had no objection to this action. Exhibit L

At this point the Secretary said that another legislative request had just come in from OMB and was due that day. It was a request for the Commission to comment on the Department of Interior's report on legislation to establish a memorial to Francis Scott Key (S.2370). Again, this was in reference to legislation the Commission has not been asked to comment on. The Secretary said Interior would support the legislation, but asked for several amendments: (1) elimination of the requirement that approval by the agencies involved (including the Commission of Fine Arts) be given within 90 days or such approval would be deemed to have been given; (2) addition of language clarifying that if

the memorial were built on Park Service land, the Interior Department would be authorized to maintain it; and (3) that the standards contained in the proposed memorial legislation, S. 2522, would apply to this memorial. The members concurred with the recommendations made by the Department of the Interior, especially the 90 day clause, as it would affect the Commission, and the Secretary said he would so notify OMB after the meeting. Exhibit M

(The Chairman then returned to the Georgetown and Shipstead-Luce appendices, which had not been discussed.)

II. E. 2. f., Appendix II. The Georgetown Act appendix was discussed first, as Mrs. Boyd had several questions. These concerned a formality involving approval of work at 1675 Wisconsin Avenue, and a question about the disapproval and subsequent approval of a greenhouse addition at 1344 39th Street. These were answered by the Chairman and the staff. Mrs. Boyd said she thought they pointed up the need for new Georgetown Board procedures. The members then approved Appendix II, subject to ratification in September.

II. E. 1. c., Appendix I. Miss Wolf asked what the purpose of the appendices was. The Secretary said they were for the members' information: the items with an asterisk were the official written actions on projects already discussed by the Commission; those without astericks were actions prepared by the staff on projects of a minor nature, not formally reviewed by the Commission. He said that if the Commission wanted to review every Shipstead and Georgetown submission, that could be arranged, but it would then be difficult to get through the agenda in one day. The only item on the Shipstead appendix that was questioned was a three story addition on Shepherd Street. Mr. Carson explained that this would actually be only 2½ stories, and that it would replace an existing one-story wood and glass addition. The new addition would be stone, matching the house in both material and detailing, and as the lot was large, would be only minimally visible from Rock Creek Park. There were no further questions, and the members present approved Appendix I, subject to ratification in September.

The members then turned to a Park Service submission, not on the printed agenda, security barriers for the Pennsylvania Avenue side of the White House. Mr. Parson recalled that in 1983 they had been asked by the Secret Service to set up a barrier system at the gates of the White House and after the temporary use of dump trucks parked across the gates, the Jersey barriers now in place had been installed along Pennsylvania Avenue and the south side of the White House. That step allowed time to work out a more attractive, effective system that could be put in place on a more or less permanent basis. Mr. Summerlin from the Park Service was introduced to discuss the matter further.

Mr. Summerlin said that early in the study it had been decided not to disturb any of the Olmsted landscaping inside the fence, but to do something along the sidewalk instead. Several alternatives were considered: a simple barrier along the sidewalk at the street edge; a combination of bollards, plants, low walls and seating elements; just bollards and plants; or bollards alone. The Chairman said he would prefer the openness of bollards and plants rather than the solidity of a wall. Mr. Hart suggested that the bollards might be connected by chains, a frequently used device, and the Chairman was enthusiastic about this, thinking that it would appear as something to protect the pedestrian, rather than as a barrier. He also suggested that a "ha-ha" wall could be built inside the fence and made nearly invisible with planting, and would be the least objectionable solution. However, the Secret Service said it would be not far enough away from the house.

It was thought by all that a mock-up was needed to study the effect of the bollards and plants, and it was agreed to set this up as soon as possible. Exhibit N

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT OF NEIL H. PORTERFIELD, VICE CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS, ON S. 2522, A BILL TO PROVIDE STANDARDS FOR PLACEMENT OF COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ON CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND ITS ENVIRONS, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED WATER, AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION

24 JUNE 1986

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am happy to testify at this hearing on the Senate version of a bill to provide standards for the placement of commemorative works in the Nation's capital.

The Commission of Fine Arts has for many years favored such legislation and testified earlier this year on the subject before this Subcommittee and the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. The quality of open space in the Capital is one of the Commission's highest priorities, and we are concerned by the unusually large number of memorials currently being proposed.

We are pleased to note the wider scope of S. 2522 as compared with H.R. 4378, specifically, the inclusion of lands administered by the General Services Administration as well as the National Park Service. This would protect the very important Federal Triangle area in the city.

We find that the method for proposing a memorial in Area I and the requirement for Congressional approval within 90 days strengthens the control over that area, yet does not exclude it entirely.

We also note the clear spelling out of the fact that all commemorative works in Area I and Area II must be authorized by Congress.

A new provision that we would look upon with favor is the one requiring that "the appropriate Congressional authorizing committees shall solicit the views of the National Capital Memorial Commission."

Also helpful in the new bill is the language defining Areas I and II and the definition of what is included in the term "District of Columbia and Environs." The rewriting of the site, design, and construction permit process has greatly clarified this part of the legislation.

We note that unlike the House bill, the Senate version does not address temporary memorials. There might be some merit in studying this, so if the occasion arises, there would be adequate criteria and controls to ensure that such works would be of high quality and worthy of a position in the Nation's Capital.

In summary, the Commission of Fine Arts finds the Senate bill much improved and strengthened, and I would be happy to answer any questions the committee members may have.

EXHIBIT A-1

R. 4378

Ninety-ninth Congress of the United States of America

AT THE SECOND SESSION

Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday, the twenty-first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and eighty-six

An Act

To provide standards for placement of commemorative works on certain Federal lands in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

PURPOSES

SECTION 1. The purposes of this Act are as follows:

(a) to preserve the integrity of the comprehensive design of the L'Enfant and McMillan plans for the Nation's Capital;

(b) to ensure the continued public use and enjoyment of open space in the District of Columbia;

(c) to preserve, protect and maintain the limited amount of open space available to residents of, and visitors to, the Nation's Capital; and

(d) to ensure that future commemorative works in areas administered by the National Park Service and the General Services Administration in the District of Columbia and its environs (1) are appropriately designed, constructed, and located and (2) reflect a consensus of the lasting national significance of the subjects involved.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(b) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the General Services Administration;

(c) the term "commemorative work" means any statue, monument, sculpture, memorial, or other structure or landscape feature, including a garden or memorial grove, designed to perpetuate in a permanent manner the memory of a person, group, event or other significant element of history. The term does not include any such item which is located within the interior of a structure or a structure which is primarily used for other purposes;

(d) the term "person" means an individual, group or organization authorized by Congress to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs;

(e) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term "the District of Columbia and its environs" means those lands and properties administered by the National Park Service and the General Services Administration located in Areas I and II as depicted on the map numbered 869/86501, and dated May 1, 1986.

CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF COMMEMORATIVE WORKS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND ITS ENVIRONS

SEC. 3. (a) No commemorative work may be established in the District of Columbia and its environs unless specifically authorized by Act of Congress. All such authorized commemorative works shall be subject to applicable provisions of this Act.

(b) In considering legislation authorizing commemorative works within the District of Columbia and its environs, the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Energy and Natural Resources Committee of the Senate shall solicit the views of the National Capital Memorial Commission.

NATIONAL CAPITAL MEMORIAL COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The National Capital Memorial Advisory Committee as established by the Secretary is redesignated as the National Capital Memorial Commission. The membership of the Commission shall be expanded to include:

Director, National Park Service (Chairman)
Architect of the Capitol
Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission
Mayor, District of Columbia
Commissioner, Public Building Service, General Services Administration
Secretary, Department of Defense

(b) The National Capital Memorial Commission shall advise the Secretary and the Administrator on policy and procedures for establishment of (and proposals to establish) commemorative works in the District of Columbia and its environs, as well as such other matters concerning commemorative works in the Nation's Capital as it may deem appropriate. The Commission shall meet at least twice annually.

AVAILABILITY OF MAP DEPICTING AREA I AND AREA II

SEC. 5. The Secretary and the Administrator shall make available, for public inspection at appropriate offices of the National Park Service and the General Services Administration, the map numbered 869/86501, and dated May 1, 1986.

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO AREA I AND AREA II

SEC. 6. (a) AREA I.—The conditions set forth in subsection (b) shall apply to the location of a commemorative work in Area I or in Area II. In addition, the Secretary or Administrator (as appropriate) may approve the location of a commemorative work in Area I only if he finds that the subject of the commemorative work is of preeminent historical and lasting significance to the Nation. The Secretary or Administrator (as appropriate) shall notify, after consultation with the National Capital Memorial Commission, the Congress of his determination that a commemorative work should be located in Area I. The location of a commemorative work in Area I shall be deemed disapproved, unless, not later than 150 days after such notification, the location is approved by law.

(b) AREA II.—Commemorative works of subjects of lasting historical significance may be located in Area II, subject to the following conditions:

(1) A military commemorative work may be established in Area II only to commemorate a war or similar major military conflict or to commemorate any branch of the Armed Forces. No commemorative work commemorating a lesser conflict or a unit of an Armed Force shall be permitted in Area II.

(2) A commemorative work commemorating an individual or group of individuals, other than a military commemorative work as described in subsection (b)(1) of this section, shall not be permitted in Area II until at least twenty-five years after the death of the individual or the last surviving member of the group.

(3) A commemorative work other than a work referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) may be constructed in Area II only to commemorate a subject of lasting historical significance.

SITE AND DESIGN APPROVAL

SEC. 7. (a) Any person authorized by law to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs shall comply with each of the following requirements before commencing construction of the commemorative work:

(1) Such person shall consult with the National Capital Memorial Commission regarding the commemorative work. Such consultation shall include consideration of potential sites in the District of Columbia and its environs.

(2) Following consultation in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary or Administrator (as appropriate) shall submit, on behalf of such person, site and design proposals to the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission and the Secretary or Administrator (as appropriate) for their approval.

(b) In considering site and design proposals, the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission and the Secretary and Administrator shall be guided by the following criteria:

(1) to the maximum extent possible, a commemorative work shall be located in surroundings that are relevant to the subject of the commemorative work;

(2) a commemorative work shall be so located as to prevent interference with, or encroachment upon, any existing commemorative work and to protect, to the maximum extent practicable, open space and existing public use; and

(3) a commemorative work shall be constructed of durable material suitable to the outdoor environment. Landscape features of commemorative works shall be compatible with the climate.

CRITERIA FOR ISSUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

SEC. 8. (a) Prior to issuing a permit for the construction of a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, the Secretary or Administrator (as appropriate) shall determine that:

(1) the site and design have been approved by the Secretary or Administrator (as appropriate), the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts;

(2) knowledgeable persons qualified in the field of preservation and maintenance have been consulted to determine structural soundness and durability of the commemorative work, and to assure that the commemorative work meets high professional standards;

(3) the person authorized to construct the commemorative work has submitted contracts for construction and drawings of the commemorative work to the Secretary or Administrator (as appropriate); and

(4) the person authorized to construct the commemorative work has available sufficient funds to complete construction of the project.

(b) In addition to the foregoing criteria, no construction permit shall be issued unless the person authorized to construct the commemorative work has donated an amount equal to 10 per centum of the total estimated cost of construction to offset the costs of perpetual maintenance and preservation of the commemorative work: *Provided,* That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply in instances when the commemorative work is constructed by a Department or agency of the Federal Government and less than 50 per centum of the funding for such work is provided by private sources.

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all moneys provided by persons for maintenance pursuant to this subsection shall be credited to a separate account in the Treasury.

(2) Congress authorizes and directs that the Secretary of the Treasury shall make all or a portion of such moneys available to the Secretary or the Administrator at his request for maintenance of commemorative works. Under no circumstances may the Secretary or Administrator request funds from the separate account exceeding the total moneys deposited by persons establishing commemorative works in areas he administers. The Secretary and the Administrator shall maintain an inventory of funds available for such purposes: *Provided,* That such moneys shall not be subject to annual appropriations.

TEMPORARY SITE DESIGNATION

SEC. 9. (a) If the Secretary, in consultation with the National Capital Memorial Commission, determines that a site where commemorative works may be displayed on a temporary basis is necessary in order to aid in the preservation of the limited amount of open space available to residents of, and visitors to, the Nation's Capital, he may designate such a site on lands administered by him in the District of Columbia. A designation may not be made under the preceding sentence unless, at least one hundred and twenty days before the designation, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Capital Memorial Commission, prepares and submits to the Congress a plan for the site. The plan shall include specifications for the location, construction, and administration of the site, and criteria for displaying commemorative works at the site.

(b) Any commemorative work displayed at the site shall be installed, maintained, and removed at the sole expense and risk of the person authorized to display the commemorative works. Such

person shall agree to indemnify the United States for any liability arising from the display of the commemorative work under this section.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. (a) Complete documentation of design and construction of each commemorative work located in the District of Columbia and its environs shall be provided to the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) and shall be permanently maintained in the manner provided by law.

(b) Any legislative authority for a commemorative work shall expire at the end of the five-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of such authority, unless the Secretary or Administrator (as appropriate) has issued a construction permit for the commemorative work during that period.

(c) Upon completion of any commemorative work within the District of Columbia and its environs, the Secretary or Administrator (as appropriate) shall assume responsibility for the maintenance of such work.

(d) The Secretary and the Administrator shall promulgate appropriate regulations to carry out this Act. The regulations shall be published in the Federal Register within one hundred and twenty days after the enactment of this Act.

(e) This Act shall not apply to commemorative works authorized by a law enacted before the commencement of the Ninety-ninth Congress.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Vice President of the United States and
President of the Senate.

Final version - became law in October 1986

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Fifth Avenue at 82nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10028 212-TR 9-5500

EXHIBIT A-2

July 14, 1986

The Honorable Malcom Wallop
Chairman
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved Water and Resource Conservation
United States Senate
210 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Wallop:

As the curator of American sculpture at the Metropolitan Museum I have, over the years, given considerable thought to the issues regarding the commissioning and preservation of public art in this country. I would like to share with you several of my ideas that may be helpful in the pending legislation of bills S2522 and H4378 with which you are involved.

While our public spaces are becoming overly crowded with public statuary it would be tragic to put a stop to the commissioning of future works. Each generation of special interest groups and artists should have an opportunity to express themselves in public art. That, however, does not mean that public art that is erected should be allowed to remain on view if, at a future date, it is deemed superficial in either content or aesthetic merit. France has been the most enlightened country in terms of reviewing their public works and if a work is judged unworthy it is preserved in a storage space. This enables future generations to reexamine the qualities of any given work and allows the present generation to express themselves in public art. Perhaps Washington, D.C. might establish a park or other area where sculpture could be stored and yet be seen by interested members of the public.

I often regret, in New York City for example, that so many unsuccessful pieces command such focal points. They clutter the landscape and hinder people from paying greater attention to many of the successful and meaningful public monuments we do have in the city. The overabundance of second-rate works have also made it almost impossible to develop responsible maintainance programs for public statuary. This is of primary importance as it is a major responsibility of every generation to conserve properly its artistic heritage.

Sincerely,

Lewis I. Sharp

Lewis I. Sharp
Curator and Administrator of the
American Wing

cc. Hon. Diane Wolf
Commission of Fine Arts

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT B

July 14, 1986

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, CFA

FROM: Secretary, CFA

SUBJ: Proposed Procedural Changes; Administration of Old Georgetown Act

The attached letter from the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown contains some proposals for revising procedures and time schedules for the review of submissions under the Old Georgetown Act. While I circulated this material previously, there was no time at the June meeting for discussion.

Since then the staff had given some thought to the proposals and is generally in favor of their thrust though we believe that not all should necessarily be published in a revised Federal Register listing of Procedures and Policies. The major problem we see is the specific mention of various days of the month which would be specified as deadlines for submissions and review before the Board and the Commission. While these time specifications seem simple enough, we feel they are unworkable due to the varying schedule of Commission and Board meetings. We recommend the following substitute suggestions:

(1) Regular meetings of the Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants are generally held at 10:00AM on the Tuesday sixteen days prior to a Commission of Fine Arts meeting, which is generally held on the third Thursday of each month.

(2) A draft agenda will be available for inspection one week prior to each Georgetown Board meeting.

(3) Submissions shall be made to the Permit Office of the District of Columbia two weeks prior to scheduled Georgetown Board meetings.

(4) Georgetown Board meetings will be recorded and copies may be made by appointment with supplies furnished by the requester.

In addition, the staff would recommend, in the event the Commission sees merit in these proposed changes, that we try the new procedures for several months to see how they work, prior to adopting them formally.

This matter is scheduled for discussion at the July 31, 1986 meeting.

The Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown

Box 3603 Georgetown Station • Washington, D.C. 20007

June 6, 1986

The Honorable
J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On behalf of the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, I want to express our appreciation to you and the members of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Old Georgetown Board for your careful deliberations, on-site inspections and patient consideration of community concerns regarding the Historic District of Georgetown. It is gratifying to know that the District of Columbia authorities are viewing your advice and counsel with the same weight and follow-up enforcement.

We also thank you for adopting the Policy on Additions to Houses in Georgetown, dated April 17, 1986. This will be a useful guide to future building.

We enclose four suggestions for your consideration with regard to the time and place of meetings, public notice of meetings, time of submissions, and recording of meetings.

Since I am unable at this time to appear before you myself, our Executive Committee has authorized Mrs. John G. Boyd, a trustee, to explain our views on specific applications brought before you and the Old Georgetown Board, which will reflect our long-standing position that the remaining open space, existing small scale and historic fabric of Old Georgetown be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

With my best wishes to you and the members of the Commission and the members of the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Wynant D. Vanderpool, Jr.

Enclosure

President—WYNANT D. VANDERPOOL, JR.

Trustees

JOHN W. AUCHINCLOSS
MRS. JOHN G. BOYD
THOMAS BRADLEY
MRS. W. GRAHAM CLAYTOR, JR.
NICHOLAS J. COOLIDGE
COL. ROBERT F. EVANS, U.S.A. (RET.)
MRS. CAROLYN AGGER FORTAS
JOHN HAMMOND
MRS. DONALD D. NOTMAN
THOMAS A. PARROTT
HUGH SCOTT
MRS. JOHN F. SIMMONS
MRS. ROBERT B. SMITH, JR.

Vice President
ROCKWOOD H. FOSTER
Secretary
EDWARD TERHUNE MILLER
Treasurer
CHISWELL D. LANGHORNE, JR.

Honorary Trustees
MRS. DAVID K. E. BRUCE
MRS. J. NOEL MACY

Annual support and contributions are tax deductible
Registered under the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act. No. 6-07-508

SUGGESTED CHANGES AND ADDITIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TO PROCEDURES AND POLICIES AS STATED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER OF NOVEMBER 21, 1979, VOL. 44, NO. 226.

Under Subpart A of 2102-Meetings and Procedures of the Commission

2102.1 Times and Places of Meetings

"Regular meetings of the Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants, open to the public, are held monthly on the second Thursday of the month beginning at 9:30 am in its offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 and regular meetings of the Commission, open to the public, are held monthly on the fourth Thursday of the month beginning at 10 o'clock am....."

2102.3 Public Notice of Meetings

"A draft agenda of the Georgetown Board meeting will be available to the public seven(7) working days before the Georgetown Board meeting. Upon official request of the Citizens Association of Georgetown and the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown one(1) copy of said agenda will be mailed to a designated representative of each organization."

Under Subpart B of 2102-Meetings and Procedures of the Commission

2102.10(a) change the second sentence to read as follows:

"In order to assure that a submission will be considered at the next scheduled meeting of the Commission and to have the proper amount of time for possible on-site inspections it should be delivered to the Commission's offices on the 1st of each month, or the first working day thereafter."

Under Subpart A of 2102, I have a change which we believe will help to improve the accuracy of representation before the Old Georgetown Board and the Commission. It also will help the authorities of the District of Columbia in enforcing the advice and counsel of the OGB and the CFA. Other interested parties also will have an immediate record on which to base judgments and actions. Therefore, we urge the Commission to consider adding this sentence to

2102.5 Records and minutes: public inspection

"Each Old Georgetown Board and Commission meeting will be taped. The public may obtain copies of said tapes by supplying a blank tape to the Commission staff and under staff supervision recording the original tape on a machine at the offices of the Commission."

The Commission, by adopting this policy, will be following normal administrative hearing practice. It is true that the Commission will have to purchase a machine to copy the tapes, with the interested party supplying the blank tape for the copying; but surely it is worth it if we can improve the accuracy of presentations to the OGB and the CFA, improve understanding by all parties of the advice and counsel of the OGB and the CFA and facilitate enforcement of same by the appropriate authorities.

The Georgetown community stands behind the Old Georgetown Board and the Commission of Fine Arts. On behalf of the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, I thank you for consideration of these suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

Wynant D. Vanderpool, Jr.

Wynant D. Vanderpool, Jr.
President

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT C

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

August 14, 1986

Dear Mr. Wilding:

Thank you for the excellent briefing on concept plans for the new midfield terminals proposed for the expansion of Dulles Airport. All of the members have had a chance to receive your printed data on the plans and those present on July 31, 1986 generally endorse the current concepts. There are several points we would like to reiterate.

Keeping the architectural integrity of the original terminal building is a high priority and complementing it with an unobtrusive system for expansion seems first rate. Our one caution is that this concept should be reinforced by symmetrical development and identical expansion modules so as to avoid the add-on, hodge-podge look which could quickly destroy the design integrity of the complex. In discussing the design specifics with David Childs and Marilyn Taylor during our meeting, we also expressed concern about the amount of walking within the individual terminal modules. The use of some moving walks was discussed and should be given serious study. I should add that while our official concern is with the aesthetic implications of the new additions and not with the internal workings as a terminal it would be regrettable to see the new terminal fall short in some practical sense no matter how beautiful it might be. I hope you take our concern in this context.

We look forward to further review of the plans as they progress.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James A. Wilding
Director
Metropolitan Washington Airports
Federal Aviation Administration
Washington National Airport Hangar 9
Washington, D. C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT D

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

August 14, 1986

Dear Mr. Newell:

It was a pleasure to meet with you and William Lenyk from Leo Daly Architects on 31 July 1986 to discuss additional design studies for the proposed security and maintenance facility at the International Center. Those of us in attendance found the size reduction a great improvement, but feel the design needs further refinement.

As you know, this meeting was held without a quorum. Therefore, the members present on the 31st will make their recommendations to the Commission during the meeting scheduled for 18 September 1986. Since our opinions were not unanimous, a formal presentation will be necessary. This breathing space will give the architect an opportunity to give further study to the character of the third floor windows, which in their present configuration appear to create too much of a break with the rest of the facade. The general feeling was that the façades should be given greater unity throughout all three floors.

The Commission staff is available to you should there be any questions.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Michael B. Newell
Director
International Center Project
Department of State
State Annex #1, Room W110
Washington, D. C. 20520

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT E

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

August 14, 1986

Dear Hank:

The Commission was delighted to review plans for the fence and gates proposed for the Canadian Chancery under construction on Pennsylvania Avenue. Arthur Erickson, the architect, and James Rich, of your staff, presented the designs and explained that the mirror finish stainless steel would match the window and door trim on the building. To the members present, the scheme seemed appropriate, and pending confirmation by the other members on September 18, the Commission poses no objection to the design.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Henry A. Berliner, Jr.
Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT F

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

August 14, 1986

Dear Jack:

At the meeting held 31 July 1986, the Commission was pleased to meet with John Parsons and Dave Sherman of your office and James van Sweden, the landscape architect, to discuss final plans for the proposed German-American Friendship Garden on the Washington Monument Grounds. As you may know, the meeting was held without a quorum. Therefore, the members present on the 31st will take their recommendations to the Commission during the meeting scheduled for 18 September 1986.

Their advice will cover two basic points. First, recommendation to approve the design, materials, plantings and dedicatory plaque will be advanced with the clear understanding that no grasses will be introduced and that a permanent maintenance schedule will include removal of dead vegetation and mulching of planting beds for the winter season. Second, recommendation will be made to discuss formally the merits and implications of memorializing the corporate and individual donors of the garden. Incorporating the names of such donors as part of the design for a national memorial within the Monumental Core of the Capital raises questions of precedent and appropriateness which the Commission was unable to resolve at its meeting on the 31st. It would be helpful if the Park Service could supply us with any examples of memorials within the monumental core where the names of donors have been incorporated into memorials.

In the meantime, the staff will be available to you should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W., Room 336
Washington, D. C. 20240

EXHIBIT G

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBITS
CFA Meeting 31 July 1986
Shiptead-Luce and Old Georgetown Actions

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-90	409 12th Street, S. W. 409 12th Street Associates Limited Partnership	Information submission for request of change in exterior materials

ADDENDUM TO 17 APRIL 1986 MEETING: Architect made presentation on 31 July 1986 of a cast stone for use in place of a preference for limestone made during the 17 April 1986 meeting. After showing photographs of an existing example (The Regency Hotel on N and 23rd Streets, N. W.), the Commission members approved the alternate material. For lack of a quorum, provisional approval was given by the three members present (Brown, Hart and Wolf) with the firm understanding that this action could not be construed as approval of materials for planned adjacent Portals Development.

S.L. 86-115	901 D Street, S. W. RLA/DHCD	Aerospace Building

ACTION: Issue permit for office building. Working drawings have been reviewed and approved and certified by the Architect as matching designs given concept approval. Material samples are approved as presented to the Commission on July 31, 1986.

O.G. 86-159	1206 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Champions	Satellite dish

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for existing satellite dish. Location of dish on the back roof of a new commercial structure at the rear of an alley will not be detrimental to the historic district because of limited visibility. Request that dish be painted a light grey.

O.G. 86-171, -180	1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. 1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W.	Razing

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed razing of existing one-story rear additions only, as shown on accompanying plans.

---

31 July 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-172	3025 P Street, N. W. Robert Moore Mary Mottershead	Addition

Hold for Georgetown Board Meeting on 19 August and the presentation of alternate, (or supplementary) drawings.

---

*	O.G. 86-176	1233-1235 37th Street, N. W. Georgetown University	Addition

Hold for Georgetown Board Meeting on 19 August and further discussion of the Commission suggestion to have the addition on the traditional facade line of the block, if the concept of the addition is to replace the building razed on this site.

	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-193, -194	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz Co.	New building and Raze Building

Dear Ms. Gillam:

The Commission did not have a quorum at its 31 July meeting and was thus unable to act on O.G. 86-193, and -194. We are requesting that these cases be refiled or be given an extension so that the matter of demolition of an existing apartment building and its replacement design at 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. can be discussed in public session at our next meeting on 18 September 1986.

If there are any questions, I can be reached at 566-1066.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

August 11, 1986

---

*	O.G. 86-176	1233-1235 37th Street, N. W. Georgetown University	Addition

It was decided to hold O.G. 86-176 for Georgetown Board Meeting on 4 September.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT H

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

August 14, 1986

Dear Mrs. Pope:

At its meeting on 31 July 1986 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the George and Ira Gershwin medal.

While there were no strong objections to the obverse, the reverse was not considered acceptable. As you know, the Commission has been urging that the designs for at least some of our national medals be obtained through competitions, and it was thought that the Gershwin medal offered the ideal opportunity: It will honor two men for their contributions to the arts, it has assumed special significance because of the involvement of Librarian of Congress Daniel Boorstin, and there is no tight production schedule.

The suggestion was made that this be a competition limited to sculptors or medallic artists, and that it be for design of both the obverse and reverse. As the July meeting was held without a quorum, this recommendation will be made to the Commission at the meeting scheduled for 18 September 1986.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Donna Pope
Director of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
U. S. Mint
Washington, D. C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT I

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

August 14, 1986

Dear Mr. Touchstone:

The Commission of Fine Arts met on July 31, 1986 to discuss designs of the Life Sciences Center at the University of the District of Columbia with the architect, Charles Bryant and Bernard Quarterman of the Department of Public Works. We were happy to see that the conceptual designs conformed in every way to the Master Plan and that the architectural character and materials of the new buildings will likewise be consistent with those on the rest of the campus already constructed.

The additional landscaping of the surrounding Plaza areas was also thought to be most appropriate. The large plaza to the east in the center of the campus is a bit sparse on this count, and the additional planting around the Life Sciences Buildings will be a welcome contrast. We strongly urge this element of the design be considered as part of the prime contract so there will be greater assurance it will be accomplished at the same time the new buildings are finished.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. John E. Touchstone
Director
Department of Public Works
2000 14th Street, N. W., 6th Floor
Washington, D. C. 20009

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT J

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

August 14, 1986

Dear Mr. Reiss:

The Commission was happy to meet with you again on July 31 and continue our discussions on the Smithsonian's new sign programs. We particularly appreciate the additional mock-up erected at the Natural History Museum so a good comparison could be made between the blue and red backgrounds that are at the heart of the problem.

After viewing the mock-ups we are more convinced than ever that the red background is inappropriate. The color will introduce too discordant a note to be in keeping with the dignity of our National Mall. The blue background, and especially the bright yellow logo will still be clearly visible. One way to increase the legibility of these signs further would be to increase slightly the size of the lettering and perhaps make the letters white.

As to the configuration of the signs, there was some feeling at the meeting that they do not measure up to the sense of permanence appropriate to the monumental core. A horizontal with enough thickness would ameliorate this. However, as you know, we had no quorum at the meeting, so until our next meeting on September 18, our report to you is unofficial.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Philip K. Reiss
Director
Office of Design and Construction
Smithsonian Institution
955 L'Enfant Plaza, Room 3230
Washington, D. C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT K

August 12, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: Secretary

I called Annette Rooney, legislative analyst at OMB on 12 August and reported that at its meeting on 31 July the Commission reviewed draft legislation concerning preservation of portions of the State Department Building and had no objections to it.

Charles H. Atherton

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT L

August 12, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: Secretary

I called Randy Coleman, legislative analyst at OMB, on June 20 after conferring with Vice Chairman Porterfield, and reported that the Commission would have no objection to NASA's proposed report on H.J. Res. 504 - A memorial to honor America's astronauts. The Commission's position was confirmed at the meeting on 31 July.

Charles H. Atherton

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT M

August 12, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: Secretary

I called Randy Coleman, a legislative analyst at OMB on 31 July and reported that at its meeting on that day the Commission reviewed Interior's proposed report on S.2370, a bill to erect a memorial to Francis Scott Key, and had no objections to it.

Charles H. Atherton

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT N

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

August 14, 1986

Dear Jack:

Just a brief note to confirm our discussion on July 31 of the proposal for replacing the existing Jersey barriers on Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixteenth Street. Before we go any further with variations on the solid barriers, we would like to explore the use of bollards and chains. They have the advantage of being a traditional security element, and in addition do not have the confining characteristics of the solid barricades that we feel are objectionable.

We will be meeting again on September 18, and will be happy to look at any new studies at that time.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20240

MEETING:

18 September 1986